

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the above amendments and arguments set forth fully below. Claims 1-26 were previously pending in the present application. Within the Office Action, Claims 1-26 have been rejected.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Also within the Office Action, Claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,983,310 to Rouse et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Rouse") in view of United States Patent Publication No. 2006/0247915 to Bradford et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Bradford").

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claimed features must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, because neither Rouse nor Bradford, either alone or in combination, disclose all of the limitations of Claims 1-3, 14, 17-21, and 24-26.

Specifically neither Rouse nor Bradford teach or suggest "a service-descriptor software module which includes executable instructions to identify valid actions corresponding to each identified type of data, the valid actions including searching a database of phone numbers, searching a database of universal

resource locators, searching a database of names of human beings, searching a database of names of locations, and searching a database of addresses.”

Rouse involves providing mobile device users with access to web directories for sending messages to other mobile device users. However, the Examiner concedes that Rouse does not teach or suggest “a platform-framework software module which includes executable instructions to receive input from a user; a data-type software module which includes executable instructions to identify types of data that might be returned to the user, the types of data being selected from a list of possible types of data based on input from the user; a service-descriptor software module which includes executable instructions to identify valid actions corresponding to each identified type of data, the valid actions being selected from a list of possible actions; [or] a processor, capable of executing at least one of the software modules.” The Applicants agree.

Additionally, Rouse does not teach or suggest “searching a database of names of locations.” Within the Office Action, the Examiner cites Col. 9, Lines 35-41 of Rouse to support his contention that Rouse teaches “searching a database of names of locations” and cites Col. 9, Lines 45-55 to support his contention that Rouse involves names of locations as a searchable data type. The Applicants admits that Rouse involves addresses as a data type. However, Rouse never differentiates between addresses and names of locations.

On the other hand, Claims 1 and 18 include this distinction explicitly. Those with ordinary skill in the art having the benefit of the Applicants' disclosure would immediately recognize that the disclosure and the claimed invention provides a new level of utility by allowing the ability to search databases for addresses as well as searching databases for location types such as "Home", "Business", "Vacation House", etc.

Likewise, Bradford does not teach or suggest "a service-descriptor software module which includes executable instructions to identify valid actions corresponding to each identified type of data, the valid actions including searching a database of phone numbers, searching a database of universal resource locators, searching a database of names of human beings, searching a database of names of locations, and searching a database of addresses," nor does the Examiner suggest that it does. In fact, Bradford fails to distinguish between addresses and names of locations to the same extent that Rouse does.

On the contrary, Claims 1 and 18 include this limitation explicitly and Claims 2-3, 14, 17, 19-21, and 24-26 include the limitation by reference to Claims 1 and 18. For at least this reason, Claims 1-3, 14, 17-21, and 24-26 are not rendered obvious in light of a hypothetical combination of Rouse and Bradford.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully posits that the pending claims have been distinguished from the art of record, and that all objections to and rejections of the claims have been overcome. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance. Should the Examiner deem it helpful he is encouraged to contact Applicant's attorney, at (650) 474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "E. Ruzich".

Elizabeth Ruzich

Reg. No. 54,416

Customer No. 22862